1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 10 TERRY D. DIXON, 11 Petitioner, 12 VS. 13 RENEE BAKER, et al., 14 Respondents. 15 16 Respondents move this Court for an enlargement of time of 14 days from the current due date of 17 February 25, 2022, up to an including March 11, 2022, in which to file their response to the motion for 18 evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 90). This Motion is made pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b) and Rule 6-1 of 19 the Local Rules of Practice and is based upon the attached declaration of counsel. This is the second 20 enlargement of time sought by Respondents to file the response, and the request is brought in good faith 21 and not for the purpose of delay. 22 DATED February 25, 2022 23 Submitted by: 24 25 AARON D. FORD Attorney General 26 By: /s/ Jessica Perlick 27

28

Case No. 3:13-cv-00248-RJC-CSD ORDER GRANTING UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING (ECF NO. 90) (SECOND REQUEST) Jessica Perlick (Bar. No. 13218) Senior Deputy Attorney General Page 1 of 4

1

## **DECLARATION OF JESSICA PERLICK**

2

STATE OF NEVADA
COUNTY OF CLARK

1.

) ss:

3

I, JESSICA PERLICK, being first duly sworn under oath, deposes and states as follows:

I am an attorney licensed to practice law in all courts within the State of Nevada and am

56

employed as a Senior Deputy Attorney General in the Office of the Nevada Attorney General. I have been assigned to represent Respondents in *Terry D. Dixon v. Renee Baker, et al.*, Case No. 3:13-cv-

7 8

00248-RJC-CSD, and as such, have personal knowledge of the matters contained herein.

9

2. This motion is made in good faith and not for the purposes of delay.

10

3. The deadline to file the response to Dixon's motion for evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 90) is February 25, 2022.

1112

13

4. I previously requested an extension for this response, as well as a reply in support of the

motion to dismiss Dixon's amended petition, to account for already-existing deadlines including a reply

14

brief in Murray v. Howell, 21-15104, responses in Shue v. Johnson, 2:20-cv-02025; Guevara-Pontifes v. Baker, 3:20-cv-00652; and Palmer v. Gittere, 3:18-cv-00245; and an answering brief in Conners v.

1516

Hutchings, 21-15693; as well as the time needed to provide coverage during colleagues' annual leave.

17

request, I referenced the need to prioritize an answer in Guy v. Baca, 2:11-cv-01809, which is

I have been unable with due diligence to complete the response herein. In my previous

18 19

unfortunately still in progress. In January I was dealing with a health issue that was impacting my work.

20

Although I have since recovered, I am still working to catch up on outstanding deadlines that were

21

22

6. Finally, in addition to working to catch up on everything impacted by the health issues in

23

January, last week I had oral argument in Murray v. Howell, 21-15104, so I also spent significant time

24

25

preparing for that.

5.

7. I have communicated with counsel for Dixon regarding this request, and she indicated that

26

she does not object to this extension.

impacted, including the answer in Guy.

27

28

8. I am filing a separate request for additional time to file the reply in support of the motion to dismiss (ECF No. 71), seeking the same 14-day extension.

## Case 3:13-cv-00248-RCJ-CSD Document 99 Filed 03/01/22 Page 3 of 3

1	9.	For the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request an enlargement of time of 14 days, up to
2	and including March 11, 2022, in which to file the response to the motion for evidentiary hearing.	
3	Execu	ted on February 25, 2022.
4		/s/ Jessica Perlick
5		Jessica Perlick (Bar No. 13218)
6	IT IS SO QR	DERED:
7		( an en
8	UNITED STA	ATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	Dated: March	1 10022
10	Viaicii	1, 2022.
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>		
$\begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 26 \end{bmatrix}$		
20 27		
$\begin{bmatrix} 27 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$		
_0		